

REMARKS

Claims 43-56 are presented for consideration, with Claims 43 and 48 being independent.

The independent claims have been amended to further distinguish Applicants' invention from the cited art.

Claims 43, 45, 48, 50 and 53-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Chee '108 in view of Bui '772. The remaining claims are understood to stand rejected as allegedly being obvious over Chee and Bui (and not Takasu as indicated in the Office Action) and further in view of Okumura '844 (Claims 44 and 49), Miyamoto '559 (Claims 46 and 51) or Ho '365 (Claims 47 and 52). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' invention as set forth in Claim 43 relates to a display apparatus comprised of a display panel including a plurality of display elements, and display control means for controlling the display panel in a normal display mode, and in first, second and third power saving modes, wherein the first power saving mode is the mode in which the display panel displays an image. In addition, mode transition means causes the display panel to shift to the first power saving mode or the third power saving mode from a normal mode based on an instruction of a user, and causes the display panel to shift automatically to the second power saving mode from the normal mode. As amended, Claim 43 sets forth that the shift from the normal mode to the second power saving mode does not involve a reduction of a frame size of an image displayed on the display panel, and the shift from the normal mode to the first or third power saving mode involves a reduction of the frame size.

Support for the amendments to Claim 43 can be found, for example, on page 36, line 1, *et. seq.*, of the specification. In accordance with Claim 43, a high performance, power saving display apparatus can be provided.

Claim 48 relates to a method of controlling a display apparatus and corresponds substantially to Claim 43. Claim 48 has thus also been amended to recite that the shift from the normal mode to the second power saving mode does not involve a reduction of a frame size of an image displayed on the display panel, and a shift from the normal mode to the first or third power saving mode involves the reduction of the frame size.

The primary citation to Chee is directed to a computer system provided with a display panel 12, means for controlling the display panel, and a power saving controller and timers for operating the display panel. The Office Action asserts that the display panel can be controlled in a normal display mode, a first power saving mode, a second power saving mode and a third power saving mode.

The Office Action acknowledges that Chee does not teach the first power saving mode being a mode in which the display panel displays an image, since Chee's first power saving mode is triggered when the user closes the notebook cover or engages a shutdown switch.

The secondary citation to Bui is cited to compensate for the deficiency in Chee. Bui relates to a method for reducing video display power usage by dithering the brightness. In that regard, Bui discloses brightness controls of high, medium, drain and custom (column 3, line 64 through column 4, line 1).

Without conceding the propriety of combining Chee and Bui in the manner proposed in the Office Action, it is submitted that such a combination still fails to teach or

suggest Applicants' claimed invention. For example, the proposed combination of art does not teach or suggest that shifting from a normal mode to the second power saving mode does not involve a reduction of a frame size of a displayed image while the shift from the normal mode to the first or third power saving mode does involve a reduction of the frame size. As discussed above, the power consumption in Bui is achieved by controlling the display brightness. Chee also fails to teach or suggest a power saving mode involving a reduction of the frame size.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 43, 45, 48, 50 and 53-56 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

The tertiary citations to Okumura, Miyamoto and Ho have been discussed in previous Amendments. Suffice it to say that these references fail to compensate for the deficiencies in Chee and Bui as discussed above with respect to Applicants' independent claims. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 44, 46, 47, 49, 51 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. §103 are respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in independent Claims 43 and 48 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 44-47 and 49-56 set forth additional features of Applicants' invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

#### REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW

If the claims as presented above do not place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number shown below in order to schedule a personal interview.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

---

Scott D. Malpede  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM/vnm

FCBS\_WS 1418453v1